

### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed May 23, 2003 (Paper No. 2). Claims 1-23 and 25-29 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1, 13, and 23 being the independent claims. Claims 1-5, 7, 13-19, 23, and 26-29 have been amended, and Claim 24 has been canceled herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Before proceeding to the merits of the Office Action, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Swiatek for his indication that Claims 1-4, 9-16, 21, and 22 are allowed, and that Claims 5-8, 17-20, 24, and 26 are directed to patentable subject matter. Additionally, Applicants wish to note that at least the above-noted amendments to Claims 1-5, 7, 13-19, and 26-29 are merely cosmetic in nature, and are provided to even more clearly define the invention.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

Claims 23, 25, 27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,499,699 (Salenc et al.). At least in view of the foregoing amendments, this rejection is traversed.

Independent Claim 23 relates to a method of balancing a dynamic unbalanced rotating assembly on a vehicle that includes a system having a rotational assembly mounted on a vehicle, and one or more momentum devices rotationally mounted on the rotational assembly. The claimed method includes the step of rotating the rotational assembly about an axis of rotation relative to the vehicle, and recites, *inter alia*, rotating each momentum device to thereby apply momentum in a vector perpendicular to the axis of rotation to generate a compensation torque during rotation of the rotational assembly so as to compensate for dynamic unbalance of the rotational assembly.

Salenc et al. relates to a satellite attitude control system, and discloses three rotating reaction wheels, each having an axis of rotation perpendicular to one another. Nowhere does Salenc et al. disclose, or even remotely suggest, one or more momentum devices rotationally mounted to a rotational assembly and, therefore, does not disclose or suggest rotating each momentum device, as recited in independent Claim 23.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully solicited.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

#### CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 103

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Salenc et al.

In response, Applicants submit that the foregoing rejection is now moot in view of the amendment to independent Claim 23, which now recites features not disclosed or suggested in Salenc et al.

Hence, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 112

Claims 5-8 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that it is unclear how “a” momentum device can be further limited to “a first and a second” momentum device.

In response, and while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite “one or more” momentum device, and have amended other dependent claims consistent with this terminology.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the § 112 rejections be withdrawn.

#### CONCLUSION

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 13, and 23 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because they recite features which are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent

abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Moreover, if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: August 21, 2003

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz  
Reg. No. 45,264  
(480) 385-5060